



COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

RECEIVED
SEP 20 2002
TECHNOLOGY CL.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT:	Kevin Mark McFarland	}
SERIAL NO.:	09/431,636	
FILED:	November 1, 1999	
FOR:	Modular, Knock-Down Tanning Bed	

ART UNIT: 3739

EXAMINER: Farah, A.

To: Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

REMARKS

Undersigned acknowledges receipt of the Advisory Action dated August 21, 2002.

Undersigned has filed herewith a request for continued examination. Undersigned believes that the fees paid with the request for continued examination is profoundly unfair to applicant. Why should Applicant have to subsidize the mistake made in the official office action? Paragraph one of the Advisory Action acknowledges the error.

The only analysis of applicant's amendment is found in paragraph two of the Advisory Action.

Does the Examiner mean that the application will be allowed if the "knock-down coupling means" is defined to the Examiner's satisfaction?